

STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND

VIP TRADING ESTATE AND VIP INDUSTRIAL ESTATE

09 OCTOBER 2019

Quod

VIP Trading Estate and VIP Industrial Estate

Contents

1.	Introduction	2
2.	Appendices	2
3.	The Appeal Proposals	2
4.	Environmental Impact Assessment	3
5.	Background	4
6.	Planning application background and process	7
7.	Uses	15
8.	Sustainability and Transport	17
9.	Design, Access and Amenity	18
10.	Matters in dispute and no longer in dispute	19
11.	Planning conditions and obligations	21
12.	Agreement	22
	Appendix 1: Planning application document and drawing list	23
	Appendix 2: Business Relocation Strategy	36

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This Statement sets out the matters that are agreed and those that are disputed between Leopard Guernsey Anchor Propco Ltd (**the Appellant**) and the Mayor of London acting through the Greater London Authority (**the GLA**) and the Royal Borough of Greenwich (**RBG**) as local planning authority in respect of an appeal against the refusal of permission by the Mayor of London (planning application reference 16/4008/F).

2. Appendices

- 2.1 The following are appended to this Statement and agreed:
- The amended plans and drawings are noted in Appendix 1.
 - The Business Relocation Strategy is provided at Appendix 2.
- 2.2 The parties reserve the right to comment on the contents of the Business Relocation Strategy.

3. The Appeal Proposals

- 3.1 The planning application, which is the subject of this appeal, was made on 06 December 2016 and amended on 22 December 2017 and 03 December 2018 (**the Application**). The Application is full planning permission to redevelop land at the VIP Trading Estate, Charlton (**the Site**) as follows for:

“Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 11 buildings ranging from 2 to 10 storeys in height for Class C3 residential use (771 units), with flexible uses comprising Class B1 (Business), Class A1- A3 Retail /Restaurant), Class D1 (Community) and Class D2 (Leisure) at ground floor and first floor level, alterations to existing vehicular access and creation of new pedestrian access from Anchor and Hope Lane and the riverside, creation of new areas of open space and landscaping together with the provision of associated car parking, cycle spaces, refuse and recycling storage, plant and all other associated works.” (the Proposals)

- 3.2 The Royal Borough of Greenwich resolved to refuse planning permission on 9 July 2018 and the application was called-in and refused by the Mayor of London on 13 February 2019 (following a representation hearing on 29 January 2019). The Mayor’s reasons for refusal are as follows:

- 1. The proposal does not constitute development of the highest quality as required by policy. Its poor design, layout and massing, gives rise to an overly constrained residential environment and to an inadequate and compromised public realm. The proposal would therefore not comprise sustainable development and would be contrary to the NPPF, London Plan (2016) Policies 3.5, 7.1, 7.4, 7.5, 7.6 and 7.7, draft London Plan Policies D1, D4, D6 and D7, Greenwich Local Plan Policies H5, DH1 and DH2 and the Charlton Riverside SPD (2017).*
- 2. The proposal fails to ensure a satisfactory relationship with the retained commercial building at Imex House. It fails to provide a safe and convenient access to the business. It introduces noise sensitive uses to the site without providing demonstrably appropriate, sufficient or deliverable mitigation measures contrary to the Agent of Change principles thus threatening the sustainability of this local business. The development would not constitute sustainable*

development and is contrary to the NPPF, London Plan (2016) Policy 7.15, draft London Plan Policies GG5, D12 and D13, the Mayor's Culture and Night-time Economy SPG (2017) and the Charlton Riverside SPD (2017).

3. *The proposal fails to provide any floorspace suitable for the relocation of existing established businesses on the site and fails to provide a suitable and robust mechanism to secure suitable alternative premises for these existing occupiers. The development would not constitute sustainable development and would be contrary to the NPPF, London Plan (2016) Policies 4.4, draft London Plan Policies GG5, E4 and E7, and the Charlton Riverside SPD (2017).*
4. *The proposal, in the absence of a S106 agreement to secure affordable housing and other obligations, would fail to provide the maximum reasonable level of affordable housing or adequately mitigate the other harmful impacts of the development, contrary to London Plan (2016) Policies 3.12, 3.18, 5.2, 6.2 and 8.2, draft London Plan Policies H6, S1, E2, S12, T3 and DF1, Greenwich Local Plan Policies H3, EA(c), E1 and IM1, the Mayor's Affordable Housing & Viability SPG and the Charlton Riverside SPD (2017).*

4. Environmental Impact Assessment

- 4.1 The Proposals are 'EIA development' under the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011 (**the Regulations**). The application was accompanied by an environmental statement (**ES**).
- 4.2 Following the submission of the Application, clarification documents were submitted, as well as an amended ES (**Amended ES: Core Documents 1.5-1.11**). The Amended ES was 'further information' under Regulation 22 of the EIA Regulations, and was processed as required by the EIA Regulations.
- 4.3 The ES is compliant with the Regulations.
- 4.4 The GLA took the ES, Amended ES and consultation responses on it (together the '**environmental information**') into account when determining the planning application. The mitigation measures identified in the Amended ES are to be secured through the planning conditions and/or planning obligations annexed to this Statement if planning permission were to be granted.

5. Background

The appeal site

- 5.1 The Site is located within the wider Charlton Riverside, an area stretching between Woolwich to the east and Greenwich Peninsula to the west. Charlton Riverside is designated by the London Plan (2016) as an Opportunity Area. The Royal Borough of Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy and Detailed Policies 2014 (**the Local Plan**) designates Charlton Riverside as a Strategic Development Location. The Local Plan proposes a new residential-led mixed use urban quarter.
- 5.2 The Site comprises two parcels of land referred to as 'Plot A' and 'Plot B', together extending to a total area of 2.53 hectares.
- 5.3 Plot A is the northern-most plot. It is bounded by commercial/industrial units to the north, east and south and residential properties at Atlas Gardens and Derrick Gardens and Anchor and Hope Lane to the west. Plot A currently comprises three large buildings of approximately 2 storeys in height with surrounding hardstanding. A number of businesses occupy the site and operate across a variety of Use Classes (B2, B8 and Sui Generis).
- 5.4 Plot B is bound by Atlas Gardens to the north; commercial/industrial units to the south and east; and Anchor and Hope Lane to the west. Plot B comprises a single-storey building, a shed with a height of two storeys with surrounding hardstanding that is currently occupied by vehicle hire companies (Sui Generis).
- 5.5 There is limited vegetation on the Site. There are 16 mature London Plane trees within the western boundary which are subject to Tree Protection Orders (ref. TPO253). A small number of semi-mature and mature London Plane trees are also present at the Site's south-eastern boundary.
- 5.6 Currently, the only access to the Site is via a single lane private road off Anchor and Hope Lane, which also serves adjacent industrial businesses to the east.
- 5.7 The Site is approximately 350m from Charlton Station, with frequent services to Central London, including Cannon Street (24 minutes), Charing Cross (30-34 minutes) and London Bridge (17-20 minutes). Bus services run along Anchor and Hope Lane and provide regular access to North Greenwich, Woolwich and beyond. Woolwich Station will soon be served by Crossrail with 12 trains per hour to central London. There is also an aspiration to provide a new River Bus pier at Charlton Riverside. The TfL PTAL mapping tool identifies that the site has a PTAL ranging from 2 in the north to 4 in the south. The appellant's Transport Assessment indicates that the Site has an average PTAL rating of 4 and this may be increased in the future as the wider area is redeveloped.
- 5.8 The majority of the site is not located within a conservation area and does not contain any listed buildings or structures, nor any nationally designated heritage assets; however it does adjoin the Charlton Riverside Conservation Area and Stone Foundries, which is a locally listed building, as are Atlas and Derrick Gardens. The strip of land within the Site between Atlas and Derrick Gardens does fall within the Conservation Area. The Site, like much of the north RBG riverside, is in a Flood Risk Area.

Planning policy context

- 5.9 An overview of the planning policy relevant to the consideration of the Appeal is set out below. This is not an exhaustive policy overview and the parties reserve the right to refer to other policy documents in evidence.

Relevant development plan documents

5.10 The Statutory Development Plan for RBG comprises:

- The RB Greenwich Local Plan, comprising the Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (July 2014); and
- The London Plan (2016).

5.11 These development plan documents are supported by the following guidance:

- The Mayor's Housing SPG (2016);
- The Mayor's Play and Informal Recreation SPG (2012);
- Affordable Housing and Viability SPG (2017);
- Character and Context SPG (2014);
- Sustainable Design and Construction SPG (2014); and
- RB Greenwich's Charlton Riverside SPD (2017).

Material Considerations

5.12 Both parties agree that other material considerations of relevance to the Appeal include:

- National Planning Policy Framework ('NPPF') (2019);
- Planning Practice Guidance (PPG);
- The Draft New London Plan – Consolidated suggested changes version (July 2019); and
- RBG's Draft Site Allocations Preferred Approach (Reg 18) (Aug 2019).

Relevant guidance and evidence base documents

5.13 The following guidance and evidence base documents are of relevance to the appeal (dates provided where available):

- South East Housing Market Assessment Report (South East London Housing Partnership);
- Affordable Housing Viability Assessment Report – updated December 2012 (RBG, 2012);
- Greenwich Employment Land Review (URS, September 2012);
- Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (JBA Consulting, October 2011);
- Towards a Greener Royal Greenwich – Green Infrastructure Study 2017 (LUC, May 2017);
- South East London Waste Technical Paper (South East London Joint Waste Working Group);
- Infrastructure Delivery Plan for Royal Greenwich (RBG);
- Royal Borough of Greenwich Consultation Response: Draft London Plan (28 February 2018)
- Strategic Housing Market Assessment (Mayor of London, Nov 2017);
- Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (Mayor of London, Nov 2017);
- Removing the Barriers to Housing Delivery (Outer London Commission, Mar 2016);
- Housing Space Standards (HATC, Aug 2006);

Planning designations

- 5.14 The Charlton Riverside area is designated an Opportunity Area in the London Plan. The Local Plan identifies the area as a Strategic Development Location and provides a significant opportunity for new high-quality development. Paragraph 4.2.7 of the Core Strategy, which supports policy EA2, states that *“The area will be transformed into an attractive and vibrant mixed use urban quarter providing around 3,500-5,000 new homes.”* Policy EA2 states that Employment will be consolidated to maximise the use of land whilst maintaining employment levels in the waterfront area.
- 5.15 The site is classed as non-designated industrial land for policy purposes – i.e. existing industrial land that does not form part of a Strategic Industrial Location (**SIL**) or a Locally Significant Industrial Site (**LSIS**).
- 5.16 The Site is within a Local Park Deficiency Area (identified on Figure 5 of the RBG Local Plan).

6. Planning application background and process

Planning history

6.1 There are no consents on the site that are directly relevant to this appeal.

Consideration of the application

6.2 The proposals have been the subject of consultation with officers at the RBG and the GLA as well as with local businesses and residents. The following summarises the various stages of consultation with the RBG and the GLA:

- December 2015: pre-application advice provided by the GLA.
- June 2016: proposals were considered by the RB Greenwich Design Review Panel (**DRP**).
- November 2016: further pre-application advice from GLA officers.
- February 2017: following submission of the application in January 2017, the GLA issued a Stage 1 report on the application.
- December 2017: a revised scheme was submitted to the RB Greenwich, reducing the number of residential units from 975 to 771, reducing building heights and making other design amendments.
- February 2018: further consideration by the RB Greenwich DRP.
- July 2018: Officers at RB Greenwich published their report to the Planning Committee, which considered the application on 9 July 2018, refusing the application against officer advice.
- August 2018: The Mayor of London issued a direction to call in the application and act as local planning authority for the purposes of determining it.
- January 2019: GLA officers publish their Stage 3 report ahead of consideration by the Mayor.

6.3 GLA officers, in their Stage 3 report, recommended that the Mayor approve the application. The eight reasons given for this are set out at paragraph 3 of the Stage 3 report and summarised below.

- i. The site lies within an Opportunity Area and the local policy framework supports the redevelopment of the site for housing and employment purposes. The report states: *“The principle of a residential led, mixed use development is strongly supported by both strategic and local planning policy.”* The design and proposed conditions and obligations would *“ensure the successful co-location of the development with surrounding land uses.”*
- ii. The scheme would provide 771 residential units, 292 of which would be affordable (at 40% by habitable room, 38% by unit). The housing would be high quality and the mix would respond to local need. *“Overall, the scheme would make a significant contribution to housing delivery targets for Greenwich.”*
- iii. The design, massing, landscaping, public routes and spaces were all considered to be high-quality. Less than substantial harm to setting of the Charlton Riverside Conservation Area was identified, but officers considered this to be outweighed by the other scheme benefits, notably housing delivery (including affordable housing), community facilities, the contribution toward new infrastructure, public realm and ecological enhancements.
- iv. The principles of inclusive access were considered to be “embedded” within the proposed development.
- v. The development would achieve a high standard of sustainable design and construction.
- vi. There would be an acceptable impact on neighbourhood amenity. Officers reported that, *“No neighbouring residential properties would experience unacceptable reductions to their daylight and sunlight. The proposals would not unacceptably reduce privacy to neighbouring residential properties and issues of noise and disturbance to adjacent premises would be adequately mitigated through planning conditions.”*

- vii. The proposed amount of car parking would be acceptable.
- viii. Appropriate planning conditions and obligations were proposed that would mitigate the environmental impacts and ensure the development would be acceptable in planning terms.

6.4 For these reasons, officers concluded as follows:

“Taking the development plan as a whole, it is considered that the proposals accord overall with the development plan and it is not considered that there are any material considerations indicating that the proposal should be refused, notwithstanding its overall compliance with the development plan.”¹

The evolution of the appeal scheme

6.5 The proposal changed since being originally submitted in January 2017 to that considered by the GLA in January 2019. The table below compares the key aspects of the originally submitted scheme and that ultimately considered and refused by the Mayor on 13 February 2019:

Table 1: Evolution of the appeal scheme

Scheme aspect	Original submission (January 2017)	Scheme at time of RBG Planning Board (July 2018)	Final scheme (January 2019)
Units	975 (143 affordable – 14.6%)	771 (250 affordable – 32.4%)	771 (292 affordable – 37.8%)
Number of buildings and heights	9 buildings, 2 – 28 storeys. Block AEN, 9/11 storeys; Block AES, 9/16 storeys; Block A1, 16 storeys; Block A2, 16 storeys; Block AWN, 2/6 storeys; Block AWS, 3/6 storeys; Block B3, 28 storeys; Block BW, 9/11 storeys; and Block BE, 6/12 storeys.	11 buildings, 2 – 10 storeys. Blocks ABC, 4/9/10 storeys; Blocks DEF, 6/8/9 storeys; Blocks GH, 2/3/4/5/6 storeys; Blocks JKL, 7/10 storeys; and Blocks MNO, 10 storeys.	11 buildings, 2 – 10 storeys. Blocks ABC, 10 storeys; Blocks DEF, 8/9/10 storeys; Blocks GH, 2/3/4 storeys; Blocks JKL, 5/10 storeys; and Blocks MNO, 10 storeys.
Employment floorspace (B1) (GIA)	1,560 sqm	3,068 sqm	3,097 sqm
Commercial floorspace (A1-A5) (GIA)	690 sqm	149 sqm	149 sqm
Community floorspace (D1/D2) (GIA)	407 sqm	834 sqm (D1 and D2)	834 sqm (D1 and D2)

6.6 The most significant change has been to the building heights and the overall number of units. The original design included 975 residential units in nine buildings across the two plots, including a 28-storey tower at the southern end of Plot B and three 16-storey towers on Plot A. This height profile was reduced to a maximum of 10 storeys.

6.7 The remainder of this section expands on the evolution of the scheme.

¹ GLA Stage 3 report, paragraph 365

- 6.8 On 19 November 2015 the applicant held a pre-application meeting with the GLA. The GLA strongly recommended further consultation with RBG and raised potential issues of building height, density and providing an appropriate mix of uses.
- 6.9 The first pre-application meeting with RBG was held on 19 January 2016. A scheme comprising buildings up to 28 storeys was discussed, with RBG recommending that the height of the buildings be significantly reduced, and the density lowered. The next pre-application meeting was held on 2 June 2016 at which the applicant sought to justify the height and density of the scheme with more detailed designs. Proposals for tall buildings were scaled back to a maximum of 21 storeys. RBG commented that they were still concerned about the height of the buildings and the density being above London Plan standards. Three further pre-application meetings were held with RBG on 11 August, 15 September and 20 October 2016 from which the proposals were further revised, including changes to siting, massing and layout.
- 6.10 A final pre-application meeting was held with the GLA on 19 November 2016.
- 6.11 The application was submitted on 9 December 2016 and proposed:

“Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 9 buildings ranging from 2 to 28 storeys in height for Class C3 residential use, with Class B1 employment space and flexible uses comprising Class A1 (retail), Class A3 (Café/ Restaurant), Class D1 (Community Use) and Class D2 (Leisure) at ground floor and first floor level, alterations to existing vehicular access and creation of new pedestrian access from Hope and Anchor Lane and the riverside, creation of new areas of open space and landscaping together with the provision of associated car parking, cycle space, refuse and recycling storage, plant and all other associated works.”

- 6.12 The Stage 1 comments of the Mayor dated 20 February 2017 included design comments in paragraphs 34-40, which amongst other things stated that *“overall, the applicant has responded positively to the feedback provided throughout the pre-application process and as a result GLA officers are generally supportive of the overall layout.”* This support was caveated with the following suggested amendments and requests for information made in paragraphs 35-40 of the report:
- The servicing road at the base of the tower building should be rationalised to ensure that the building responds positively to the street and future development context of the adjacent sites;
 - The applicant should explore privacy measures to ensure that the southern frontage does not become *“blank frontage”* and provide further street level views;
 - It should be demonstrated how the land safeguarded for delivery of the East West Route can provide safe pedestrian access with generous pavement widths;
 - Concerns were raised with regards to the overall quantum of development on Plot A and the applicant should reduce building AES by at least three stories;
 - Further daylight/sunlight evidence should be produced to show that the spaces between buildings A1 and AWN, and the tower building do not adversely affect other areas of the development;
 - The design of the podium buildings should be revisited;
 - With regard to Plot B, concerns were raised in respect of the impact of the 28 storey tower on the podium courtyard spaces. In addition, the glazed tiers on building B-East should be removed to help mediate the scale of development; and
 - *“Further justification”* should be provided for the proposed scale of development to demonstrate how it is of the highest architectural standards, helps improve local legibility and

permeability and positively relates to its surrounding context, given that it would be significantly taller.

6.13 Officers at RBG recognised the regeneration status of the area but expressed concern that the proposals conflicted with the emerging SPD for Charlton Riverside. The SPD was adopted in June 2017 and, after several meetings with officers and RBG members, the scheme was amended to reduce the height to no more than 10 storeys and increase the amount of non-residential floorspace. The number of residential units was reduced to 771.

6.14 These proposals were presented to the Charlton Stakeholder Forum on 29 November 2017 and formally submitted as revised proposals on 22 December 2017. The description of development was revised to the following:

“Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 11 buildings ranging from 2 to 10 storeys in height for Class C3 residential use, with flexible uses comprising Class B1 (Business), Class A1 – A3 (Retail/Restaurant), Class D1 (Community) and Class D2 (Leisure), at ground floor and first floor level, alterations to existing vehicular access and creation of new pedestrian access from Anchor and Hope Lane and the riverside, creation of new areas of open space and landscaping together with the provision of associated car parking, cycle spaces, refuse and recycling storage, plant and all other associated works.”

6.15 Following this, the design was reviewed by CABE on 15 January 2018. Their comments led to further revisions including reducing the height of the buildings adjacent to Atlas and Derrick Gardens and increasing the heights of others, with the result that the number of units remained at 771. There followed a public exhibition of the proposals on 2/3 March 2018.

6.16 Further design changes arose following comments by TfL regarding the required width of the East-West route, for which 20 metres had been allowed, whereas TfL required 24 metres. This was accommodated by amending the design to Buildings J and MN, in April 2018.

6.17 RBG’s Planning Board considered a recommendation to approve the application on 17 April 2018 but deferred their decision. The proposals were again considered on 9 July 2018, again with a recommendation to approve. RBG officers set out their view at paragraphs 2.2 – 2.12 of their report, stating:

“The principle of mixed use development is in accordance with the relevant development plan policies and the vision set out in the Charlton Riverside Masterplan SPD.

The proposed replacement employment space is considered to be of a high quality and has the potential to increase the numbers of jobs on the site compared with the existing industrial uses. Appropriate provision is made through S106 clauses to address the relocation of existing businesses and to ensure that the proposed employment space meets the needs of small and medium sized enterprises and start-ups. Appropriate provision is also made in terms of floorspace for community uses.

The proposal will provide 770 new homes of which 25% would be affordable. The mix of affordable units meets the policy requirement of providing a 70/30 split between social rented and intermediate units. The proposed level of affordable housing has been viability tested and is considered the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing that can be delivered on the site.

The proportion of family units in the scheme is lower than that envisaged by the Charlton Riverside masterplan SPD as only 17% of units would be of family size. However, this is considered acceptable having regard to the likely impact that an increased level of family housing would have on the overall viability of the scheme.

Some units within the scheme would not achieve the recommended levels for internal daylight and sunlight. However, the provision of amenity space and play facilities exceeds the recommended standards. Overall the standard of amenity for future occupants is considered acceptable.

Parts of the scheme exceed the building heights envisaged by the Charlton Riverside Masterplan SPD however the revised scheme has addressed the relationship between the proposed development and adjacent buildings and it is considered that taller buildings can be supported in the less sensitive parts of the site. The architectural design is of a high quality and the scheme would bring about improvements to the townscape compared with the existing site conditions.

The overall density of the scheme also exceeds the recommended density levels set out in the London Plan and the SPD but is considered acceptable having regard to the site's location within an Opportunity Area and the need to bring forward regeneration.

An assessment of the impact of the scheme upon the significance of heritage assets concludes that any harm to the character and appearance of the recently designated conservation area and its setting and would be less than substantial and that the impacts upon locally listed buildings would not be such as to harm their significance.

Satisfactory standards of residential amenity would be maintained for neighbouring occupiers having regard to the assessment of impacts upon privacy, daylight / sunlight and wind conditions.

Subject to conditions in relation to noise the potential for conflict between the proposed residential use and the nearby safeguarded wharves will be minimised. S106 clauses will be secured to address noise impacts from adjacent commercial uses.

The proposed level of parking is considered appropriate having regard to the current level of public transport accessibility and a range of measures will be secured by condition / S106 to address the transport impacts of the development."

- 6.18 The Planning Board resolved to refuse the application, should the Mayor of London not call the application in for his own determination. The Planning Board's resolved reasons for refusal are as follows:

Reason for Refusal 1

Due to the excessive height of the buildings, together with their massing and design, the proposed development would result in the overdevelopment of the site and would fail to adhere to the vision for the redevelopment of the area set out in the Charlton Riverside SPD 2017. As such the proposal is contrary to policies 3.4, 3.5, 7.4, 7.6 and 7.7 of the London Plan (2016) and policies H5, DH1 and DH2 of the Royal Greenwich Core Strategy with detailed Policies (2014) and the guidance set out in the Charlton Riverside SPD 2017.

Reason for Refusal 2

The proposed proportion of family sized housing falls below that envisaged by the Charlton Riverside SPD 2017 and the application fails to demonstrate that the amount of family sized housing within the development has been maximised. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy H5 of the Royal Greenwich Core Strategy with detailed Policies (2014) and policy 3.8 of the London Plan (2016)".

Reason for Refusal 3

The proposed development would fail to provide a safe and convenient vehicular access to the adjacent business premises at Imex House and, in the absence of a satisfactory scheme of soundproofing to Imex House, would introduce noise sensitive uses to the site with the potential to create conflict between the existing business and future occupants of the development. The proposed development is therefore contrary to policies DH1 and E(a) of the Royal Greenwich Core Strategy with detailed Policies (2014) and policies 7.6 and 7.15 of the London Plan 2016.

Reason for Refusal 4

The proposed development would result in the loss of existing employment floorspace and fails to make appropriate replacement employment floorspace provision which meets the needs of and which is affordable to small and medium sized businesses in the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy EA1 of the Royal Greenwich Core Strategy with detailed Policies (2014) and the guidance provided by the Charlton Riverside SPD 2017 (in particular section 5.4).

Reason for Refusal 5

Due to the height of the proposed buildings and their proximity to existing residential properties the proposed development would result in an unacceptable reduction in daylight and overshadowing of external amenity spaces to properties in Atlas Gardens and Anchor and Hope Lane as well as a loss of privacy to properties in Derrick Gardens, Atlas Gardens and Anchor and Hope Lane through overlooking. In addition the proposal fails to provide adequate levels of internal daylight and sunlight to the proposed residential units within the development. As such the proposal would adversely affect the amenity of neighbouring occupiers and would provide a poor quality living environment for future occupants of the development contrary to policy 7.6 of the London Plan (2016) and policies DH(b) and H5 of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies July 2014.

- 6.19 The Mayor called-in the application due to the site's potential for delivering housing (including affordable housing) in the context of a local authority that was under-delivering versus its targets. The Mayor stated at paragraph 28 of his Stage 2 report:

"As noted, Greenwich Council's recent delivery of housing and affordable housing is below the minimum targets and the proposed development has the potential to make a substantial and positive contribution to the strategic housing and affordable housing targets of the London Plan by optimising the use of an accessible and underutilised site, thereby helping to address recent under-delivery both in the Borough and strategically. Furthermore, the Council's targets for completions and approvals are expected to increase under the draft London Plan."

- 6.20 He went on to state in his letter:

"I must also have regard to targets identified in development plans. As set out in the attached report, I recognise that Greenwich Council has taken a positive approach to approving new homes in the borough during the last three years, and is currently performing well in securing planning approvals for additional housing and affordable housing relative to its annual targets. Notwithstanding this, I note that the proportion of affordable housing secured relative to overall housing consented during this period is significantly below the Greenwich Local Plan 35% target and represents a significant undersupply of affordable housing in the pipeline."

In my view the proposed development has potential to make an important contribution to housing and affordable housing supply in response to London Plan policies 3.3 and 3.11 and draft London Plan Policies H1 and H5. Having regard to the above, and noting the potential contribution of the proposed development, I wish to fully consider this case as the local planning authority.”

6.21 The leader of the Royal Borough of Greenwich, Cllr Danny Thorpe, provided a letter on 14th August 2018 in response to the Mayor of London’s letter dated 13th August 2018. In his letter he states the following:

“The stage II response does acknowledged that a significant number of new homes have been approved by the Borough in recent years, being 275% above the target for overall homes and 140% above the target for affordable homes. The rate of delivery of these homes has fallen below the target in previous years, however the issuing of a planning permission for the VIP site would not necessarily assist with the delivery targets and may simply serve to bolster the ‘permissions granted’ target, which is already being exceeded.

Going forward, as demonstrated by the Annual Monitoring Report 2016-17, the Royal Borough has a robust, deliverable five year housing land supply. In compliance with the NPPF, this includes provision for a 20% buffer brought forward from later in the plan period. Additionally, the Royal Borough has also identified specific, developable sites for year 6-10 of the housing trajectory, again with a substantial buffer above the London Plan overall housing target. The housing trajectory demonstrates that over the 15 year period, the Royal Borough will meet the overall housing requirement.”

6.22 There followed a series of design changes as a result of detailed discussions with GLA officers. These are set out at paragraph 20 of the GLA Stage 3 report and were as follows:

- Reduction in height of Building G by two storeys and introduction of a set-back to create a part three, part four-storey building.
- Reduction in height of Building J by two storeys (to five storeys).
- Increase in height of Building D by one storey (to ten storeys).
- Increase in height of Buildings E and F by one storey to part eight, part nine and part ten storeys.
- Increase in the quantum of flexible commercial floorspace from 3,201 sqm to 3,250 sqm (GEA), 3,068 sqm to 3,097 sqm (GIA).
- Reduction in the number of car parking spaces by two and an increase in cycle parking from 1,323 to 1,400 spaces.
- Alteration to the residential mix to increase the number of one and two bedroom units (by two and five units respectively) and reduce the number of three and four bedroom units (by one and two units respectively).

6.23 The level of affordable housing that could be offered was also re-appraised, in particular with regard to the availability of grant funding. Assuming that grant funding would be available the affordable element was increased to 292 units (of 771): equivalent to 38% of the total number of units and 40% of the habitable rooms. Without grant funding the revised scheme was considered likely to be able to provide 35% affordable housing (by unit).

6.24 As a result of these changes, GLA officers were able to recommend approval of the application to the Mayor for the reasons set out in paragraph 6.3 above.

- 6.25 Despite this recommendation, the Mayor refused the application at a hearing on 29 January 2019. His reasons were set out in the decision notice dated 13 February 2019 and are set out at paragraph 3.2.
- 6.26 The Council's view is that it has reviewed each of its previously resolved reasons for refusal set out at paragraph 6.18 above, in accordance with guidance. In order to ensure that its case is focused and to reduce the potential for duplication (bearing in mind its status as a Rule 6 party rather than the local planning authority in this case), it will not provide evidence in support of each of the reasons which underlay members' objection to the proposal. Instead, its evidence will address its reasons 1, 3 and 4 only (urban design, relationship with IMEX House and employment respectively).
- 6.27 The Borough Council will not provide evidence in regards to reasons 2 and 5 (family housing and daylight/sunlight).

7. Uses

Housing

- 7.1 The scheme would provide 771 residential units, of which 292 would be affordable, secured on a grant funded basis (40% by habitable room, 38% by unit). The proposed housing mix responds to local need.
- 7.2 Table 3.1 of Policy 3.3 of The London Plan 2016 sets a ten year housing target 2015-2025 for RBG of 26,850. This equates to an annual monitoring target of 2,685 additional homes per year. RBG Core Strategy Policy H3 requires that developments of 10 or more homes or residential sites of 0.5ha or more provide at least 35% affordable housing, with a tenure split of 70% social / affordable rented and 30% intermediate housing.
- 7.3 Paragraph 73 of the NPPF requires LPAs to identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable site to provide a minimum of five years' worth of housing against the adopted strategic housing requirement. Further to London Plan Policy 3.3, Greenwich should seek to achieve and exceed a minimum annual average housing target of 2,685 dwelling per annum.
- 7.4 RBGs 2017/18 Authority Monitoring Report (**AMR**) covers the reporting period 1 April 2017 to 31 March 2018. The residential units completed each year since the start of the current London Plan period are as follows:
- 2486 units completed in 2015/16;
 - 2116 units completed in 2016/17; and
 - 1900 units completed in 2017/18.
- 7.5 The Government's 2018 Housing Delivery Test (**HDT**) for Greenwich was 108 per cent. As set out in paragraph 73 of the NPPF, this requires the addition of a 5% buffer to the five year minimum requirement. The parties agreed that the five year minimum requirement is to be calculated as follows:
- Adopted strategic housing requirement (2685 x 5) of 13,425; plus
 - Past under delivery since the start of the plan period (2015/16 onwards); plus
 - 5% buffer.
- 7.6 Figure 3 (p.8) of RBGs 2017/18 AMR states that Greenwich has a supply of specific, deliverable sites to provide 16,274 residential units over the five-year period. Figure 3 also calculates that the five year minimum requirement (inclusive of 5% buffer) is 15,727. This equates to 5.2 years' supply.
- 7.7 The five year supply includes a small sites windfall allowance in years 4 and 5 (RBG AMR 2017/18, paragraph 6.7). A windfall allowance of 226 units per annum (**p/a**), equivalent to the small sites component of the adopted strategic housing requirement, has been incorporated into the supply from year four onwards. The 12 year historic trend for completions on small sites, as published by the GLA demonstrates an annual completion rate of 234p/a, evidencing the windfall allowance that is included in the 2017/18 Housing Trajectory (https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/nlp_ex_26_response_to_sq_matter_20_8_march.pdf). The parties agree that the approach to small sites windfall allowance is compliant with the NPPF.
- 7.8 Appendix A of RBG's 2017/18 AMR includes details of all of the large sites (greater than 0.25ha) included in the Housing Trajectory, including the planning status of the site, phasing of delivery (years

1-5, 6-10 or 11-15) and commentary identifying if the site is considered by the Council to be 'deliverable' as defined by the NPPF 2019.

- 7.9 The Draft New London Plan (July 2019 version) proposes to increase the 10-year requirement for RBG to 32,040 dwellings. Paragraph 4.1.8B encourages boroughs to set out a *'realistic, and where appropriate, stepped housing delivery target over a ten-year period.'*
- 7.10 The affordable housing proposals have been the subject of independent financial review and it is agreed that the proposals promote the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing, consistent with policy 3.2 of the London Plan (2016). If the Inspector was minded to approve the appeal, a review mechanism would be secured to ensure that if an agreed level of progress is not made within 24 months of grant of planning permission and would secure additional affordable homes if viable, and a further review would be triggered on disposal of 75% of the residential units.
- 7.11 The scheme would make a significant contribution to housing delivery targets for Greenwich, including the delivery of affordable housing. The Mayor took account of this need in calling in the planning application and in his determination of the application.
- 7.12 The proposals make provision of social infrastructure floorspace including creche and community uses, which is compatible with the proposed residential uses and complies with planning policy.

Employment

- 7.13 The principle of a mixed-use scheme including residential on the appeal site is acceptable in land use terms.
- 7.14 The workspace proposed has the capacity to support a greater number of jobs than the capacity of the existing floorspace.
- 7.15 The appellants have committed in the (draft) section 106 obligation to a Business Relocation Strategy (see Appendix 2).

8. Sustainability and Transport

- 8.1 The Proposals, subject to conditions, demonstrate the ability to comply with sustainability objectives including minimising carbon dioxide emissions, using energy efficiently and including renewable energy in accordance with the energy hierarchy. No objections were raised in respect of flood risk, delivery of sustainable urban drainage, ecology and urban greening.
- 8.2 The environmental impacts of the Proposals, in terms of minimising exposure to poor air quality, wind conditions, addressing contaminated land and waste management, are acceptable taking into account the proposed mitigation measures.
- 8.3 The Proposals would safeguard land needed for the East-West Link Road consistent with the SPD and in line with London Plan Policy 2.13 and draft London Plan Policy SD1.
- 8.4 If the Inspector was minded to approve this appeal the above would be secured by planning condition and obligations.
- 8.5 The quantum of proposed car parking across all uses is acceptable subject to a suitable framework of controls including a car parking management plan, electric vehicle charging points, travel plans and car club spaces, which if the Inspector was minded to approve the appeal would need to be secured through appropriate conditions. The proposal strikes an appropriate balance between promoting new development and encouraging cycling, walking and public transport use.

9. Design, Access and Amenity

9.1 Minimum space standards, as expressed by London Plan (2016) Table 3.3 and by Table 3.1 of the draft New London Plan, are met by all units within the proposed development scheme.

Access

9.2 The Proposals have embedded the principles of inclusive access and comply with the relevant inclusive design housing standards. As such, the scheme complies with London Plan Policies 7.2 and draft London Plan Policies D3 and D5.

Amenity (with the exception of Imex House)

9.3 The parties to this Statement agree that the Proposals would have an acceptable impact on neighbourhood amenity, in particular:

- No neighbouring residential properties would experience unacceptable reductions to their daylight and sunlight; and
- The strategic industrial operations at the nearby Safeguarded Wharves would be safeguarded through the use of appropriate planning conditions, subject to detailed wording.

9.4 RBG guidelines on amenity space standards are met for 99.6% of the proposed units and no policy objection arises in this respect.

Imex House

9.5 RBG has received no complaints from residents of Atlas Gardens or Derrick Gardens regarding noise emanating from Imex House (although this cannot be verified by the GLA) and offers have been made to sound-proof Imex House at the developer's cost, secured through planning obligations.

9.6 A topic specific SOCG regarding the relationship of Imex House to the proposed development in relation to noise will be prepared alongside the proofs of evidence.

Townscape and Visual Effects

9.7 The Mayor considers that there would be less than substantial harm to the significance of the Charlton Riverside Conservation Area and the locally listed assets at Atlas and Derrick Gardens contained within it, by reason of the visual impact on setting. However, this did not form a reason for refusal as the Mayor considers that this harm is outweighed by the public benefits of the scheme.

9.8 The removal of existing areas of vehicle storage that exist between Atlas and Derrick Gardens and replacement with new landscaped public routes into the site, will enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, and a strategy for investigating and recording non-designated heritage assets on site has been secured.

9.9 The proposals adhere to the principles of designing out crime.

10. Matters in dispute and no longer in dispute

10.1 The following matters are in dispute between the Appellant and the Mayor:

- The quality of the development having regard to design, layout and massing, the residential environment and public realm, contrary to the NPPF, London Plan (2016) Policies 3.5, 7.1, 7.4, 7.5, 7.6 and 7.7, draft London Plan Policies D1, D1A, D1B, D2, D4, D6, D7 and D8, Greenwich Local Plan Policies H5, DH1 and DH2 and the Charlton Riverside SPD (2017);
- Whether there will be a satisfactory relationship with Imex House, in terms of access and noise conflicts, contrary to the NPPF, London Plan (2016) Policy 7.15, draft London Plan Policies GG5, D12 and D13, the Mayor's Culture & Night-time Economy SPG (2017) and the Charlton Riverside SPD (2017); and
- Whether the proposal makes acceptable provision for the existing employment uses on the site contrary to the NPPF, London Plan (2016) Policy 4.4, draft London Plan Policies GG5, E4 and E7, and the Charlton Riverside SPD (2017).

10.2 The Council objects to the grant of planning permission on the basis of the following:

1. Due to the excessive height of the buildings, together with their massing and design, the proposed development would result in the overdevelopment of the site and would fail to adhere to the vision for the redevelopment of the area set out in the Charlton Riverside SPD 2017. As such the proposal is contrary to policies 3.4, 3.5, 7.4, 7.6 and 7.7 of the London Plan (2016) and policies H5, DH1 and DH2 of the Royal Greenwich Core Strategy with detailed Policies (2014) and the guidance set out in the Charlton Riverside SPD 2017.
3. The proposed development would fail to provide a safe and convenient vehicular access to the adjacent business premises at Imex House and, in the absence of a satisfactory scheme of soundproofing to Imex House, would introduce noise sensitive uses to the site with the potential to create conflict between the existing business and future occupants of the development. The proposed development is therefore contrary to policies DH1 and E(a) of the Royal Greenwich Core Strategy with detailed Policies (2014) and policies 7.6 and 7.15 of the London Plan 2016.
4. The proposed development would result in the loss of existing employment floorspace and fails to make appropriate replacement employment floorspace provision which meets the needs of and which is affordable to small and medium sized businesses in the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy EA1 of the Royal Greenwich Core Strategy with detailed Policies (2014) and the guidance provided by the Charlton Riverside SPD 2017 (in particular section 5.4).

10.3 The following matters are no longer in dispute between the Appellant and RBG:

- RBG Planning Board's reason for refusal 2 and 5.

10.4 The Appellant considers that paragraph 74 of the NPPF places the onus on the local authority to demonstrate that it has a five year supply of housing land.

10.5 In relation to paragraph 7.3 of this Statement, the Appellant believes that planning policy supports a residential led mixed-use development of the appeal site and that the mix of uses proposed in the appeal proposal is directly consistent with the development plan.

10.6 The Appellant disputes the cases set out above for the borough and the Mayor – but these matters will be pursued in evidence.

11. Planning conditions and obligations

- 11.1 The Appellant agrees in principle with the draft conditions put forward by the GLA. These are addressed on pages 14 and 15 of the GLA hearing report GLA/3800/03 (29 January 2019) and as set out in the Draft Conditions document published on the date of the hearing.
- 11.2 The Appellant agrees in principle with the terms of the draft planning obligations, set out at paragraphs 330-338 of the GLA hearing report GLA/3800/03 (29 January 2019) and as amended by the GLA representation hearing report addendum GLA/3800/04 (29 January 2019).

12. Agreement

12.1 This Statement of Common Ground has been prepared jointly between the Mayor, RBG and the Appellant.


Signed on behalf of the Mayor of London

Name	Signature	Date
Juliemma McLoughlin		9 October 2019
.....

Signed on behalf of the Royal Borough of Greenwich

Name	Signature	Date
Ben Oates		9 October 2019
.....

Signed on behalf of the Appellants (Leopard Guernsey Anchor Propco Ltd)

Name	Signature	Date
John Rhodes		9 October 2019
.....

Appendix 1: Planning application document and drawing list

December 2018 Submission	Date
Documents list	
Design and Access Statement	December 2017
Design and Access Statement Addendum	December 2018
Landscape and Biodiversity DAS Addendum	December 2018
Environmental Statement Non-Technical Summary	December 2018
Environmental Statement Volume I: Main Report	December 2017
Environmental Statement Volume II: TVHIA	December 2017
Environmental Statement Volume III: Technical Appendices	December 2017
Addendum Environmental Statement Volume I: Main Report	December 2018
Addendum Environmental Statement Volume II: TVHIA	December 2018
Addendum Environmental Statement Volume III: Technical Appendices	December 2018
Planning Statement	December 2016
Planning Statement Addendum	December 2017
Statement of Community Involvement	December 2016
Statement of Community Involvement Addendum	March 2018
Transport Assessment	December 2017

Transport Assessment Addendum	December 2018
Employment Study	December 2016
Energy Statement	December 2018
Sustainability Statement	December 2016
Sustainability Statement Addendum	December 2017
BREEAM Pre-Assessment December	December 2016
BREEAM Pre-Assessment Addendum	December 2017
Internal Daylight and Sunlight Report	December 2018
Utilities Assessment	December 2017
Viability Assessment	December 2016
GVA Viability Update Letter dated 15.01.18	January 2018
Arboricultural Impact Assessment	December 2016
Ramboll EIA Implications Letter dated 21.02.18	February 2018
Ramboll EIA Response Letter dated 23.02.18	February 2018
EB7 Daylight, Sunlight, Overshadowing and Solar Glare Letter dated 21.02.18	February 2018
GVA Scheme Revisions Letter dated 19.02.18	February 2018
GVA Scheme Revisions Letter dated 19.02.18	February 2018
Glenny Tenant Relocation Strategy dated 20.02.18	February 2018
GVA Scheme Revisions Letter dated 03.04.18	April 2018
Noise map_east part_Plot A	April 2018

ExA_1752_SK-01 12+ Play Strategy	March 2018
Environmental Implications Letter dated 13.04.2018	April 2018
Response to Transport Comments 30821/D25 16 February 2018	February 2018
GVA Email: 28.02.2018 Re Edge of site issues	
GVA Email: 21.03.2018 Response to PLA	
GVA Email: 22.03.2018 Re Daylight and sunlight	
GVA Email: 22.03.2018 Re Employment	
GVA Email: 22.03.2018 Clarification of unit mix	
GVA Email: 29.03.2018 Confirmation of daylight and sunlight parameters	
GVA Email: 05.04.2018 Agreement of S106 heads of terms	
GVA Email: 11.04.2018 Details of noise attenuation	
GVA Email: Ramboll Memo 13.04.2018	April 2018
30821/AC/213 Swept path analysis	March 2018
30821/AC/220 Existing Vehicle Spaces	February 2018
PLA response letter	April 2018
Drawings List	
G000 – Contextual Building	
10046-A-DRG-Z0-G000-2030-PL-RS Site Location Plan - Proposed Roof A0 1:1000 - C	
10046-A-DRG-Z0-G100-0001-PL-RS General Site View Rev C	

10046-A-DRG-Z0-G100-0002-PL-RS Navigation Plan Rev C
10046-A-DRG-Z0-G100-2000-PL-RS GA Plan - Site - Ground Floor Rev E
10046-A-DRG-Z0-G100-2001-PL-RS GA Plan - Site - Level 01 Rev C
10046-A-DRG-Z0-G100-2002-PL-RS GA Plan - Site - Level 02 Rev D
10046-A-DRG-Z0-G100-2003-PL-RS GA Plan - Site - Level 03 Rev D
10046-A-DRG-Z0-G100-2004-PL-RS GA Plan - Site - Level 04 Rev D
10046-A-DRG-Z0-G100-2005-PL-RS GA Plan - Site - Level 05 Rev D
10046-A-DRG-Z0-G100-2006-PL-RS GA Plan - Site - Level 06 Rev D
10046-A-DRG-Z0-G100-2007-PL-RS GA Plan - Site - Level 07 Rev D
10046-A-DRG-Z0-G100-2008-PL-RS GA Plan - Site - Level 08 Rev D
10046-A-DRG-Z0-G100-2009-PL-RS GA Plan - Site - Level 09 Rev D
10046-A-DRG-Z0-G100-2030-PL-RS GA Plan - Site - Roof Plan Rev D
10046-A-DRG-Z0-G100-2099-PL-RS GA Plan - Site - Basement Rev D
10046-A-DRG-Z0-G100-2130-PL-RS GA Plan - Site - Future road Rev B (Indicative)
10046-A-DRG-Z0-G100-4001-PL-RS GA Elevation - Proposed - Site Elevations North & South Rev D
10046-A-DRG-Z0-G100-4002-PL-RS GA Elevation - Proposed - Site Elevations East & West Rev D
10046-A-DRG-Z1-G100-2099-PL-RS GA Plan - Plot A - Site - Basement 1 Rev D
10046-A-DRG-Z1-G100-3001-PL-RS GA Section - Plot A - Section 1 & 2 Rev B
10046-A-DRG-Z1-G100-4001-PL-RS GA Elevation - Plot A - Elevation 01 - North Elevation, East Elevation Rev B
10046-A-DRG-Z1-G100-4002-PL-RS GA Elevation - Plot A - Elevation 02 - South Elevation, West Elevation Rev B

10046-A-DRG-Z1-G100-4003-PL-RS GA Elevation - Plot A - Elevation 03 - Internal site Elevation 1 & 2 Rev B
10046-A-DRG-Z1-G100-4004-PL-RS GA Elevation - Plot A - Elevation 04 - Internal site Elevation 3 & 4 Rev B
10046-A-DRG-Z2-G100-2099-PL-RS GA Plan - Plot B - Site - Basement 1 Rev B
10046-A-DRG-Z2-G100-2000-PL-RS GA Plan - Plot B - Site - Ground Floor Rev E
10046-A-DRG-Z2-G100-2001-PL-RS GA Plan - Plot B - Site - First Floor Rev C
10046-A-DRG-Z2-G100-2130-PL-RS GA Plan - Plot B - Site - Future road Rev B (Indicative)
10046-A-DRG-Z2-G100-3001-PL-RS GA Section - Plot B - Section 1 & 2 Rev C
10046-A-DRG-Z2-G100-4001-PL-RS GA Elevation - Plot B - Elevation 01 - North Elevation, East Elevation Rev D
10046-A-DRG-Z2-G100-4002-PL-RS GA Elevation - Plot B - Elevation 02 - South Elevation, West Elevation Rev D
10046-A-DRG-Z2-G100-4003-PL-RS GA Elevation - Plot B - Elevation 03 - Internal site Elevation Rev D
G200 – GA Building
10046-A-DRG-A-G200-2000-PL-RS Building A - Plot A - Level 00 Rev A
10046-A-DRG-A-G200-2001-PL-RS Building A - Plot A - Level 01 Rev A
10046-A-DRG-A-G200-2002-PL-RS Building A - Plot A - Apartment Layouts - Level 02 Rev C
10046-A-DRG-A-G200-2003-PL-RS Building A - Plot A - Apartment Layouts - Level 03 Rev C
10046-A-DRG-A-G200-2004-PL-RS Building A - Plot A - Apartment Layouts - Level 04 Rev C
10046-A-DRG-A-G200-2005-PL-RS Building A - Plot A - Apartment Layouts - Level 05 Rev C
10046-A-DRG-A-G200-2006-PL-RS Building A - Plot A - Apartment Layouts - Level 06 Rev C
10046-A-DRG-A-G200-2007-PL-RS Building A - Plot A - Apartment Layouts - Level 07 Rev C
10046-A-DRG-A-G200-2008-PL-RS Building A - Plot A - Apartment Layouts - Level 08 Rev C

10046-A-DRG-A-G200-2009-PL-RS Building A - Plot A - Apartment Layouts - Level 09 Rev B
10046-A-DRG-A-G200-2030-PL-RS Building A - Plot A - Roof Plan - Roof Rev A
10046-A-DRG-B-G200-2000-PL-RS Building B - Plot A - Level 00 Rev C
10046-A-DRG-B-G200-2001-PL-RS Building B - Plot A - Level 01 Rev B
10046-A-DRG-B-G200-2002-PL-RS Building B - Plot A - Apartment Layouts - Level 02 Rev C
10046-A-DRG-B-G200-2003-PL-RS Building B - Plot A - Apartment Layouts - Level 03 Rev C
10046-A-DRG-B-G200-2004-PL-RS Building B - Plot A - Apartment Layouts - Level 04 Rev C
10046-A-DRG-B-G200-2005-PL-RS Building B - Plot A - Apartment Layouts - Level 05 Rev C
10046-A-DRG-B-G200-2006-PL-RS Building B - Plot A - Apartment Layouts - Level 06 Rev C
10046-A-DRG-B-G200-2007-PL-RS Building B - Plot A - Apartment Layouts - Level 07 Rev C
10046-A-DRG-B-G200-2008-PL-RS Building B - Plot A - Apartment Layouts - Level 08 Rev C
10046-A-DRG-B-G200-2009-PL-RS Building B - Plot A - Apartment Layouts - Level 09 Rev C
10046-A-DRG-B-G200-2030-PL-RS Building B - Plot A - Roof Plan - Roof Rev A
10046-A-DRG-C-G200-2000-PL-RS Building C - Plot A - Level 00 Rev A
10046-A-DRG-C-G200-2001-PL-RS Building C - Plot A - Level 01 Rev A
10046-A-DRG-C-G200-2002-PL-RS Building C - Plot A - Apartment Layouts - Levels 02 Rev C
10046-A-DRG-C-G200-2003-PL-RS Building C - Plot A - Apartment Layouts - Level 03 Rev C
10046-A-DRG-C-G200-2004-PL-RS Building B - Plot A - Apartment Layouts - Level 04 Rev C
10046-A-DRG-C-G200-2005-PL-RS Building B - Plot A - Apartment Layouts - Level 05 Rev C
10046-A-DRG-C-G200-2006-PL-RS Building B - Plot A - Apartment Layouts - Level 06 Rev C
10046-A-DRG-C-G200-2007-PL-RS Building B - Plot A - Apartment Layouts - Level 07 Rev C

10046-A-DRG-C-G200-2008-PL-RS Building C - Plot A - Apartment Layouts - Level 08 Rev B
10046-A-DRG-C-G200-2009-PL-RS Building C - Plot A - Apartment Layouts - Level 09 Rev C
10046-A-DRG-C-G200-2030-PL-RS Building C - Plot A - Roof Plan - Roof Rev B
10046-A-DRG-D-G200-2000-PL-RS Building D - Plot A - Level 00 Rev C
10046-A-DRG-D-G200-2001-PL-RS Building D - Plot A - Level 01 Rev C
10046-A-DRG-D-G200-2002-PL-RS Building D - Plot A - Apartment Layouts - Level 02 Rev B
10046-A-DRG-D-G200-2003-PL-RS Building D - Plot A - Apartment Layouts - Level 03 Rev B
10046-A-DRG-D-G200-2004-PL-RS Building D - Plot A - Apartment Layouts - Level 04 Rev B
10046-A-DRG-D-G200-2005-PL-RS Building D - Plot A - Apartment Layouts - Level 05 Rev B
10046-A-DRG-D-G200-2006-PL-RS Building D - Plot A - Apartment Layouts - Level 06 Rev B
10046-A-DRG-D-G200-2007-PL-RS Building D - Plot A - Apartment Layouts - Level 07 Rev A
10046-A-DRG-D-G200-2008-PL-RS Building D - Plot A - Apartment Layouts - Level 08 Rev A
10046-A-DRG-D-G200-2009-PL-RS Building D - Plot A - Apartment Layouts - Level 09 Rev A
10046-A-DRG-D-G200-2030-PL-RS Building D - Plot A - Roof Plan - Roof Rev A
10046-A-DRG-EF-G200-2000-PL-RS Building EF - Plot A - Level 00 Rev B
10046-A-DRG-EF-G200-2001-PL-RS Building EF - Plot A - Level 01 Rev B
10046-A-DRG-EF-G200-2002-PL-RS Building EF - Plot A - Apartment Layouts - Level 02 Rev B
10046-A-DRG-EF-G200-2003-PL-RS Building EF - Plot A - Apartment Layouts - Level 03 Rev B
10046-A-DRG-EF-G200-2004-PL-RS Building EF - Plot A - Apartment Layouts - Level 04 Rev B
10046-A-DRG-EF-G200-2005-PL-RS Building EF - Plot A - Apartment Layouts - Level 05 Rev B
10046-A-DRG-EF-G200-2006-PL-RS Building EF - Plot A - Apartment Layouts - Level 06 Rev B

10046-A-DRG-EF-G200-2007-PL-RS Building EF - Plot A - Apartment Layouts - Level 07 Rev B
10046-A-DRG-EF-G200-2008-PL-RS Building EF - Plot A - Apartment Layouts - Level 08 Rev C
10046-A-DRG-EF-G200-2009-PL-RS Building EF - Plot A - Apartment Layouts - Level 09 Rev A
10046-A-DRG-EF-G200-2030-PL-RS Building EF - Plot A - Roof Plan - Roof Rev B
10046-A-DRG-G-G200-2000-PL-RS Building G - Plot A - Level 00 Rev C
10046-A-DRG-G-G200-2001-PL-RS Building G - Plot A - Level 01 Rev B
10046-A-DRG-G-G200-2002-PL-RS Building G - Plot A - Apartment Layouts Rev B
10046-A-DRG-G-G200-2003-PL-RS Building G - Plot A - Apartment Layouts - Levels 03 Rev B
10046-A-DRG-G-G200-2030-PL-RS Building G - Plot A - Roof Plan - Roof Rev B
10046-A-DRG-H-G200-2000-PL-RS Building H - Plot A - Level 00 Rev C
10046-A-DRG-H-G200-2001-PL-RS Building H - Plot A - Level 01 Rev V
10046-A-DRG-H-G200-2002-PL-RS Building H - Plot A - Apartment Layouts - Level 02 Rev C
10046-A-DRG-H-G200-2003-PL-RS Building H - Plot A - Apartment Layouts - Level 03 Rev C
10046-A-DRG-H-G200-2030-PL-RS Building H - Plot A - Roof Plan - Roof Rev B
10046-A-DRG-J-G200-2000-PL-RS Building J - Plot B - Level 00 Rev D
10046-A-DRG-J-G200-2001-PL-RS Building J - Plot B - Level 01 Rev B
10046-A-DRG-J-G200-2002-PL-RS Building J - Plot B - Apartment Layouts - Level 02 Rev D
10046-A-DRG-J-G200-2003-PL-RS Building J - Plot B - Apartment Layouts - Level 03 Rev B
10046-A-DRG-J-G200-2004-PL-RS Building J - Plot B - Apartment Layouts - Level 04 Rev C
10046-A-DRG-J-G200-2030-PL-RS Building J - Plot B - Roof Plan - Roof Rev A
10046-A-DRG-KL-G200-2000-PL-RS Building KL - Plot B - Level 00 Rev B

10046-A-DRG-KL-G200-2001-PL-RS Building KL - Plot B - Level 01 Rev C
10046-A-DRG-KL-G200-2002-PL-RS Building KL - Plot B - Apartment Layouts - Level 02 Rev C
10046-A-DRG-KL-G200-2003-PL-RS Building KL - Plot B - Apartment Layouts - Level 03 Rev C
10046-A-DRG-KL-G200-2004-PL-RS Building KL - Plot B - Apartment Layouts - Level 04 Rev C
10046-A-DRG-KL-G200-2005-PL-RS Building KL - Plot B - Apartment Layouts - Level 05 Rev C
10046-A-DRG-KL-G200-2006-PL-RS Building KL - Plot B - Apartment Layouts - Level 06 Rev C
10046-A-DRG-KL-G200-2007-PL-RS Building KL - Plot B - Apartment Layouts - Level 07 Rev B
10046-A-DRG-KL-G200-2008-PL-RS Building KL - Plot B - Apartment Layouts - Level 08 Rev B
10046-A-DRG-KL-G200-2009-PL-RS Building KL - Plot B - Apartment Layouts - Level 09 Rev B
10046-A-DRG-KL-G200-2030-PL-RS Building KL - Plot B - Roof Plan - Roof Rev A
10046-A-DRG-MN-G200-2000-PL-RS Building MN - Plot B - Level 00 Rev C
10046-A-DRG-MN-G200-2001-PL-RS Building MN - Plot B - Level 01 Rev D
10046-A-DRG-MN-G200-2002-PL-RS Building MN - Plot B - Apartment Layouts - Level 02 Rev D
10046-A-DRG-MN-G200-2003-PL-RS Building MN - Plot B - Apartment Layouts - Level 03 Rev D
10046-A-DRG-MN-G200-2004-PL-RS Building MN - Plot B - Apartment Layouts - Level 04 Rev D
10046-A-DRG-MN-G200-2005-PL-RS Building MN - Plot B - Apartment Layouts - Level 05 Rev D
10046-A-DRG-MN-G200-2006-PL-RS Building MN - Plot B - Apartment Layouts - Level 06 Rev D
10046-A-DRG-MN-G200-2007-PL-RS Building MN - Plot B - Apartment Layouts - Level 07 Rev C
10046-A-DRG-MN-G200-2008-PL-RS Building MN - Plot B - Apartment Layouts - Level 08 Rev D
10046-A-DRG-MN-G200-2009-PL-RS Building MN - Plot B - Apartment Layouts - Level 09 Rev D
10046-A-DRG-MN-G200-2030-PL-RS Building MN - Plot B - Roof Plan - Roof Rev B

10046-A-DRG-O-G200-2000-PL-RS Building O - Plot B - Level 00 Rev B
10046-A-DRG-O-G200-2001-PL-RS Building O - Plot B - Level 01 Rev A
10046-A-DRG-O-G200-2002-PL-RS Building O - Plot B - Apartment Layouts - Level 02 Rev A
10046-A-DRG-O-G200-2003-PL-RS Building O - Plot B - Apartment Layouts - Level 03 Rev A
10046-A-DRG-O-G200-2004-PL-RS Building O - Plot B - Apartment Layouts - Level 04 Rev A
10046-A-DRG-O-G200-2005-PL-RS Building O - Plot B - Apartment Layouts - Level 05 Rev A
10046-A-DRG-O-G200-2006-PL-RS Building O - Plot B - Apartment Layouts - Level 06 Rev A
10046-A-DRG-O-G200-2007-PL-RS Building O - Plot B - Apartment Layouts - Level 07 Rev A
10046-A-DRG-O-G200-2008-PL-RS Building O - Plot B - Apartment Layouts - Level 08 Rev A
10046-A-DRG-O-G200-2009-PL-RS Building O - Plot B - Apartment Layouts - Level 09 Rev A
10046-A-DRG-O-G200-2030-PL-RS Building O - Plot B - Roof Plan - Roof Rev A
10046-A-DRG-A-G200-4000-PL-RS GA Elevation - Plot A - Façade Elevation - Building A Rev B
10046-A-DRG-B-G200-4000-PL-RS GA Elevation - Plot A - Façade Elevation - Building B Rev B
10046-A-DRG-C-G200-4000-PL-RS GA Elevation - Plot A - Façade Elevation - Building C Rev B
10046-A-DRG-D-G200-4000-PL-RS GA Elevation - Plot A - Façade Elevation - Building D Rev B
10046-A-DRG-EF-G200-4000-PL-RS GA Elevation - Plot A - Façade Elevation - Building EF Rev B
10046-A-DRG-G-G200-4000-PL-RS GA Elevation - Plot A - Façade Elevation - Building G Rev B
10046-A-DRG-H-G200-4000-PL-RS GA Elevation - Plot A - Façade Elevation - Building H Rev B
10046-A-DRG-J-G200-4000-PL-RS GA Elevation - Plot B - Façade Elevation - Building J Rev D
10046-A-DRG-KL-G200-4000-PL-RS GA Elevation - Plot B - Façade Elevation - Building KL Rev B
10046-A-DRG-MN-G200-4000-PL-RS GA Elevation - Plot B - Façade Elevation - Building MN Rev D

10046-A-DRG-O-G200-40001-PL-RS GA Elevation - Plot B - Façade Elevation - Building O Rev A
10046-A-DRG-Z0-G200-5001-PL-RS Wheelchair Accessible Apartments - Building A Rev B
10046-A-DRG-Z0-G200-5002-PL-RS Wheelchair Accessible Apartments - Building B Rev B
10046-A-DRG-Z0-G200-5003-PL-RS Wheelchair Accessible Apartments - Building B Rev B
10046-A-DRG-Z0-G200-5004-PL-RS Wheelchair Accessible Apartments - Building C Rev B
10046-A-DRG-Z0-G200-5005-PL-RS Wheelchair Accessible Apartments - Building D Rev B
10046-A-DRG-Z0-G200-5006-PL-RS Wheelchair Accessible Apartments - Building EF Rev B
10046-A-DRG-Z0-G200-5010-PL-RS Wheelchair Accessible Apartments - Building KL Rev A
10046-A-DRG-Z0-G200-5101-PL-RS Typical Apartment - 1 Bed
10046-A-DRG-Z0-G200-5102-PL-RS Typical Apartment - 2 Bed
10046-A-DRG-Z0-G200-5103-PL-RS Typical Apartment - 3 Bed
10046-A-DRG-Z0-G200-5104-PL-RS Typical Apartment - 3 Bed Townhouse
10046-A-DRG-Z0-G200-5105-PL-RS Typical Apartment - Duplex
F900 – Space Analysis
10046-A-DRG-A-F900-2000-PL-RS Building A- Unit Matrix Rev C
10046-A-DRG-B-F900-2000-PL-RS Building B - Unit Matrix Rev C
10046-A-DRG-C-F900-2000-PL-RS Building C - Unit Matrix Rev C
10046-A-DRG-D-F900-2000-PL-RS Building D - Unit Matrix Rev C
10046-A-DRG-EF-F900-2000-PL-RS Building EF - Unit Matrix Rev C
10046-A-DRG-G-F900-2000-PL-RS Building G - Unit Matrix Rev C
10046-A-DRG-H-F900-2000-PL-RS Building H- Unit Matrix Rev C

10046-A-DRG-J-F900-2000-PL-RS Building J - Unit Matrix Rev E
10046-A-DRG-KL-F900-2000-PL-RS Building KL - Unit Matrix Rev C
10046-A-DRG-MN-F900-2000-PL-RS Building MN - Unit Matrix Rev D
10046-A-DRG-O-F900-2000-PL-RS Building O - Unit Matrix Rev B
Exa_1752_001 ILLUSTRATIVE LANDSCAPE PLAN Rev D
Exa_1752_010 LANDSCAPE LEGEND Rev B
Exa_1752_100 GA LANDSCAPE GROUND FLOOR PLAN Rev D
Exa_1752_101 Rev A GA GROUND FLOOR SHEET 1 OF 2 Rev D
Exa_1752_102 Rev A GA GROUND FLOOR SHEET 2 OF 2 Rev B
Exa_1752_112 GA PODIUM PLOT B Rev C
Exa_1752_121 GA ROOF TERRACE PLOT A BLOCKS A, B & C Rev C
Exa_1752_122 GA ROOF TERRACE PLOT A BLOCKS K & L Rev C
Exa_1752_200 PLANTING SCHEDULES AND SPECIFICATION Rev D
Exa_1752_201 PLANTING PLAN GROUND FLOOR SHEET 1 OF 2 Rev D
Exa_1752_202 PLANTING PLAN GROUND FLOOR SHEET 2 OF 2 Rev B
Exa_1752_212 PLANTING PLAN PODIUM PLOT B Rev B
Exa_1752_221 PLANTING PLAN ROOF TERRACE PLOT A BLOCKS A, B & C Rev C
Exa_1752_222 PLANTING PLAN ROOF TERRACE PLOT A BLOCKS K & L Rev C
Exa_1752_301 LEVELS GROUND FLOOR SHEET 1 OF 2 Rev C
Exa_1752_302 LEVELS GROUND FLOOR SHEET 2 OF 2 Rev B
Exa_1752_500 SECTION REFERENCE PLAN Rev C

Exa_1752_501 SECTION 1 – 4
Exa_1752_502 SECTION 5 – 8
Exa_1752_503 SECTION 9 -- 13
Exa_1752_701 LANDSCAPE SOFT DETAIL
Exa_1752_702 LANDSCAPE SOFT DETAIL
Exa_1752_703 LANDSCAPE SOFT DETAIL
Exa_1752_704 LANDSCAPE SOFT DETAIL
Exa_1752_705 LANDSCAPE SOFT DETAIL
Exa_1752_706 LANDSCAPE SOFT DETAIL

Appendix 2: Business Relocation Strategy

Rockwell

23 King Street
London SW1Y 6QY
+44 (0)20 3705 5110
info@rockwellproperty.co.
uk rockwellproperty.co.uk

Business Relocation Strategy

VIP Estates, Charlton Riverside

1 Introduction

1.1 This Business Relocation Strategy sets out the measures offered by Leopard Guernsey Anchor Propco Limited (Leopard Guernsey), owners of VIP Estates to assist with the relocation of existing businesses from their site. The objectives of the Strategy are:

1. Ensure that where possible existing business currently on the site continue to trade from an alternative location;
2. Obtain vacant possession of the site to facilitate its redevelopment.

1.2 Key requirements for this are as follows.

- Information – ensuring that tenants are provided with all essential information to maximise their awareness of the availability of the alternative premises on the market.
- Advice – ensuring tenants have access to the right professionals to advise them on the matters that will need to be considered as part of any negotiations for the relocation.
- Occupational Flexible - ensuring tenancy terms for the tenants affords them the ability to move at a time that suits their business, when the right property has been identified.
- Financial assistance – towards fees for professional advice if required to secure alternative premises.

1.3 Section 2 sets out the Business Relocation Strategy.

2 The Business Relocation Strategy

2.1 Leopard Guernsey are making a package of services available to existing tenants via their industrial agents Glenny LLP. The services offered are set out below.

Information and advice

- i. A dedicated relocation page on the VIP Sites Charlton Riverside [website](#) connecting to active commercial agents in the immediate area and to commercial property websites. This ensures that existing tenants can access information on available properties and ensure they are registered with the full range of commercial agencies.
- ii. Provide a guide to registering with commercial property agents to ensure that their requirements are closely matched with the properties available.
- iii. Those that are registered will receive alert emails from Glenny LLP on any suitably matched property that Glenny LLP are instructed on.
- iv. If a tenant chooses to retain Glenny LLP to search for premises on their behalf Glenny LLP will also monitor availability of suitable units as they become available from both their own instructions and from other agents in the market place.
- v. Glenny LLP will provide a guidance note on matters to consider when negotiating the terms of a new lease specifically considering:
 - lease length;
 - lease breaks: tenant/landlord/mutual;
 - whether excluded from the security of tenure provisions of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1954;
 - building condition; repairing liability; schedules of condition;
 - rent: open market value, payment period;
 - rent free period;
 - rent reviews: fixed, open market, indexed, frequency;
 - alienation, subletting, assignment;
 - alterations: structural, non-structural, permissions; and
 - planning: use classes.
- vi. Glenny LLP will provide details of reputable local solicitors who can assist with reviewing lease documentation on new premises.

- vii. All the information set out above will be provided to existing tenants via a pdf document that will be downloadable from the Charlton Riverside website.

Flexible tenancies

- viii. Leopard Guernsey will offer flexible rolling tenancies that will allow tenants to vacate once they have secured new premises. This will facilitate easy relocation as opportunities arise.
- ix. Where tenants have a fixed term in their leases Leopard Guernsey will offer the ability to vacate premises before the end of their lease if a suitable relocation property is available.
- x. As the development will proceed in phases there may be the opportunity for existing tenants to relocate from floor space included in early phases to those scheduled for redevelopment later. The scope for this depends upon individual businesses' requirements and the construction programme but Leopard Guernsey will look to identify opportunities.

Financial assistance

- xi. Leopard Guernsey will assist with the financial cost, up to a maximum of £1,500 plus VAT, of:
 - securing professional advice from Glenny LLP (including negotiating terms on new premises); and
 - the rent of any relocation premises (up to 10% of the annual rent).

3 The Business Relocation Strategy – Results

- 3.1 Leopard Guernsey appointed relocation agents Glenny have worked with KPT Solutions, Truck Align tenants to secure alternative space.
- 3.2 Glenny LLP are actively searching for premises for Pipe Services (Fabrication) Ltd, SE Jags, Total Body Repairs Ltd, Hire & Reward Ltd, and Musers Taxi Garage to identify and secure suitable relocation units.
- 3.3 All tenants are recommended to contact Glenny LLP.